arXiv:1108.0825v1 [math.AP] 3 Aug 2011

SCATTERING FOR THE BEAM EQUATION

CHANGXING MIAO AND YIFEI WU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the scattering for the nonlinear beam equation $u_{tt}+\Delta^2u+mu+\mu|u|^{p-1}u=0$. Our results include two aspects. In the defocusing case we show that the scattering holds for $d=1$, which extends the result in [16] to one dimension. In the focusing case, we show that the scattering holds in $\mathbb{R}^d(d\geq 1)$ when the energy $E(u_0,u_1)<E(R,0)$ and $\|\Delta u_0\|_{L^2}^2+m\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2<\|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2+m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$ for ground state R. The difficulties lie the absence of the scaling invariance and a Galilean transformation for the equation to control the Momentum vector.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the following nonlinear beam equation

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt}+\Delta^2u+mu+\mu|u|^{p-1}u=0, & (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R},\\ u(0)=u_0(x),\ \ u_t(0)=u_1(x), & x\in\mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$, $d\geq 1, m>0, \mu=\pm1$ and $1+8/d<p<2^\sharp-1$. We denote $2^\sharp=\infty$ for $1\leq d\leq 4$, and $2^\sharp=\frac{2d}{d-4}$ for $d\geq 5$. The equation is referred to as " defocusing" when $\mu=1$, while it is referred to as " focusing" when $\mu=-1$. In one-spatial dimension, a similar equation to (1.1) with a different nonlinear term has been studied as suspension bridge, see [12]. In dimension two, a similar equation was proposed in Love [11] for the motion of a clamped plate. For the more physical meaning, please refer to the book by Peletier and Troy [18]. The general theories for the Cauchy problem of (1.1) such as local well-posedness in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, global well-posedness, stability and instability of solitary and standing waves were established by Hebey and Pausader [3], Levandosky [8, 9]. The low-energy scattering for (1.1) or more general higher-order wave equations was proved in [8] and [13], respectively. For other related study on (1.1) the authors can refer to [14] for example.

In this paper, we are concerned with scattering theory for the subcritical nonlinear beam equation (1.1), which particularly in the defocusing case was conjectured in Levandosky and Strauss [10] when the authors found an analogue of the Morawetz estimate for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation. This conjecture in the dimensions $d\geq 5$ was proved by Pausader [15], where the author used the Morawetz estimate obtained in [10] combining with the ideas about frequency localization from Tao [19] to overcome the difficulties such as

---

Date: August 4, 2011.

Key words and phrases. Beam equation, scattering, blow up, concentration-compactness.

The first author was supported by the NSF of China (No.10725102).

The second author was partially supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation.

the lack of mass conservation and finite propagation speed. Recently, Pausader [16] proved the scattering theory for (1.1) in lower dimensions $2 \leq d \leq 4$ by making use of Kenig-Merle's concentration-compactness argument [6] and an interesting virial-type identity in the direction orthogonal to the Momentum vector, which can be used to overcome the lack of Galilean invariance for the nonlinear beam equation. Unfortunately, the type of virial identify in [16] can not work for $d = 1$ and the focusing case, and thus the problems for scattering in the both cases were left behind [15, 16]. In this paper, we address these two problems by developing some new techniques, which will be describe in the following.

Before stating our main results, we introduce some notations. Let $\mathcal{E} = H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the energy space, and define the following natural inner product

$$\big\langle (u_0, u_1), (v_0, v_1) \big\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(\Delta u_0 \Delta v_0 + m u_0 v_0 + u_1 v_1 \big) dx.$$

Hence, the free energy

$$E_0(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2 + |v|^2 \big) dx \cong \|(u, v)\|_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

It is well-known [8, 15, 14] that for any $(u_0, u_1) \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists a unique maximal solution

$$u(t) \in C(I; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(I; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)), \quad I = (-T_-(u_0, u_1), T_+(u_0, u_1))$$

to (1.1), such that it maintains the energy and momentum conservations in I, where

$$\begin{aligned} E(u) \triangleq & E(u, u_t) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|u_t|^2 + |\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2)\, dx + \frac{\mu}{p+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{p+1}\, dx \\ = & E(u_0, u_1), \qquad\qquad t \in I \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$P(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t \, \nabla u \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_1 \, \nabla u_0 \, dx, \qquad t \in I. \tag{1.3}$$

In particular, $I = \mathbb{R}$ for defocuing case $\mu = 1$.

In what follows, we call that the solution $u \in C(I; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(I; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ of (1.1) with initial data $(u_0, u_1) \in \mathcal{E}$ scatters in $\mathcal{E}$ if $I = \mathbb{R}$, and there exist two solutions $v^{\pm}$ of linear beam equation

$$v_{tt} + \Delta^2 v + mv = 0 \tag{1.4}$$

such that

$$\|u(t) - v^{\pm}(t)\|_{H^2} + \|u_t(t) - v_t^{\pm}(t)\|_{L^2} \to 0, \text{ as } t \to \pm\infty.$$

In [15, 16], Pausader established the following scattering property of the solutions in dimensions higher than two.

Theorem 1.1 ([15, 16]). *Let* $\mu = 1$, $d \geq 2$, *and* $1 + 8/d < p < 2^\sharp - 1$. *Let* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$, *then there exist a unique global solution* $u(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *to* (1.1) *such that* $u(t)$ *scatters in* $\mathcal{E}$.

As mentioned above, the directional virial identity developed in [16] is only suitable to use in dimensions $d \geq 2$, since it needs another direction orthogonal to the Momentum. This shows that the argument in [16] breaks down in dimension one. To overcome the difficulty, we introduce a gauge transformation to the solutions defined by

$$\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u(x,t) = e^{i\int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^{-2}\,ds + ix\cdot\xi_0} u(x,t),$$

which can be used to explore the structure behavior of the minimal energy solution or the least action element, and force the Momentum vector to be zero. Meanwhile, we apply some scaling argument to reduce the harmful effects of the lower-order term, which arises from the gauge transformation. Now we describe our first result in this paper as following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $d = 1, \mu = 1$ *and* $p > 9$*, let* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$*, then there exist a unique global solution*

$$u(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R})) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$$

to (1.1) *such that* $u(t)$ *scatters in* $\mathcal{E}$*.*

In the focusing case, one can not expect to establish a similar result as Theorem 1.2 without any other restriction. Indeed, let R be an element of the *ground states* which satisfy the elliptic equation

$$\Delta^2\phi + m\phi = |\phi|^{p-1}\phi, \tag{1.5}$$

and the least action principle. The author can refer to Section 3 below for more discussion on ground state. One may find that R is a non-scattering solution of (1.1) with the finite energy $E(R, 0)$. The existence of ground state R was proved by Fibich, Ilan and Papanicolaou [1]. In that paper, the authors also proved that the ground state obeys the best constant of the following sharp Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality,

$$\|f\|_{L^{\frac{2(d+4)}{d}}}^{\frac{2(d+4)}{d}} \leq \frac{d+4}{d}\left(\frac{M(f)}{M(R)}\right)^{\frac{8}{d}} \|\Delta f\|_{L^2}^2, \qquad f \in H^2. \tag{1.6}$$

In this paper, we prove the following

Theorem 1.3. *Let* $d \geq 1, \mu = -1$*,* $1 + 8/d < p < 2^\sharp - 1$*. Let* $(u_0, u_1) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *with*

$$E(u_0, u_1) < E(R, 0), \tag{1.7}$$

and let u be the corresponding solution of (1.1) with maximal interval of existence $I = (-T_-(u_0,u_1), T_+(u_0,u_1))$*.*

(a) *If* $\|\Delta u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$*, then u is global and scatters.*
(b) *If* $\|\Delta u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 > \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$*, then u blows up both forward and backward in finite time, i.e.,* $T_-(u_0,u_1), T_+(u_0,u_1) < \infty$*.*

Remark 1.1. *The case* $\|\Delta u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$ *is not compatible with (1.7). Indeed, it will lead to* $E(u_0,u_1) \geq E(R,0)$ *by Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.7 below. In this sense, we give a complete classification for solutions under the restricted condition* (1.7)*.*

Remark 1.2. *This result implies that the standing wave R is the minimal energy solution which is global and non-scattering. In particular, without loss of generality, for the traveling wave $\psi(x-ce_1t)$ with $e_1=(1,0,\cdots,0)$, one has*

$$E(R,0)\le E(\psi,-c\partial_1\psi),$$

in which ψ solves

$$c^2\partial_1^2\psi+\Delta^2\psi+m\psi=|\psi|^{p-1}\psi.$$

To prove Theorem 1.3, we also encounter the same difficulty as in proving Theorem 1.2, since the main part is non-necessary to be non-positive even for the standing wave solution, and thus the gauge transformation shall be also taken important role here. Meanwhile, another difficulty arises from the lack of the scaling invariance of the equation (1.1). Therefore the methods depending upon the scaling invariance in the studying of the nonlinear dispersive equation (see [4] for example) are not available to our situation. We get over this difficulty by some new variational framework and the profile decomposition, see Section 3 below. The partial idea was inspired by Ibrahim, Masmoudi and Nakanishi in [5] where the authors studied the scattering for the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation.

Notations. We use $A\lesssim B$ or $B\gtrsim A$ to denote the statement that $A\le CB$ for some large constant C which may vary from line to line, and may depend on the data and the index s. When the constant C depends on other parameters, we indicate this by a subscript, such as $C_1,C_2,\cdots$. We use $A\sim B$ to mean $A\lesssim B\lesssim A$. We use $A\ll B$, or sometimes $A=o(B)$ to denote the statement $A\le C^{-1}B$. The notation $a+$ denotes $a+\epsilon$ for any small ϵ, and $a-$ for $a-\epsilon$. $\langle\cdot\rangle=(1+|\cdot|^2)^{1/2}$. Moreover, we denote $\mathscr{F}_x$ to be the Fourier transform with respect to the variable x. At last, we define the Littlewood–Paley projections. For this, we define the function χ such that: $\chi\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $0\le\chi\le1$, and $\chi\equiv1$ on $\{|x|<1\}$; $\equiv0$ on $\{|x|>2\}$. Furthermore, let $\chi_R(x)=\chi(x/R)$. Now for $K\in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define $\widehat{P_Kf}(\xi)=\big(\chi(\frac{\xi}{K})-\chi(\frac{2\xi}{K})\big)\hat f(\xi)$, $\widehat{P_{\le K}f}(\xi)=\chi(\frac{\xi}{K})\hat f(\xi)$, $\widehat{P_{\ge K}f}(\xi)=\big(1-\chi(\frac{\xi}{K})\big)\hat f(\xi)$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall some preliminaries such as the Strichartz estimates, profile decomposition and stability theorem which will be used throughout this paper.

2.1. Strichartz estimates.

First, we give the Strichartz estimates and its direct applications such as to the small sacttering for (1.1), the global time-space estimates leads to the scatering, etc.

Lemma 2.1 (Strichartz estimates, [15])**.** *Let (a,b) be the pair such that*

$$a,b\ge2,\ b\ne\infty,\quad \frac{4}{a}\le d\Big(\frac12-\frac1b\Big),\quad \frac{2}{a}=d\Big(\frac12-\frac1b\Big)-\sigma,\ 0\le\sigma\le2,$$

and (q,r) be the pair such that

$$q,r\ge2,\quad \frac4q\le d\Big(\frac12-\frac1r\Big),\quad (q,r,d)\ne(2,\infty,4),$$

and (β, α) *be the pair such that*

$$\alpha, \beta \geq 2, \quad \frac{2}{\beta} = d\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Big), \quad (\beta, \alpha, d) \neq (2, \infty, 2).$$

Let $u(t) \in C(I; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(I; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *be the solution of*

$$\partial_{tt} u + \Delta^2 u + mu = F, \tag{2.1}$$

with the initial data $\big(u(0), u_t(0)\big) = (u_0, u_1)$*, then for any time interval* $I = [t_0, t_1]$*,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|u\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|u_t\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} + \|u\|_{L^a_t L^b_x} \\ \lesssim &\|u_0\|_{H^2} + \|u_1\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^{q'}_t L^{r'}_x} + \|F\|_{L^{\beta'}_t L^{\alpha'}_x}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Let the time-space $S(I)$ be defined as

$$S(I) \triangleq L_{xt}^{\frac{2(d+4)}{d+8}p}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_{xt}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d+4}p}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

One easily verify the following lemma which shows that the global time-space estimate leads to the scattering.

Lemma 2.2 ([14, 16])**.** *Let* $(u_0, u_1) \in \mathcal{E}$*,* $u(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *be the global solution of* (1.1) *such that*

$$\|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} < +\infty.$$

Then $u(t)$ *scatters.*

Define the linear solution operator

$$\mathcal{W}(t) = \left(\cos\sqrt{\Delta^2 + m}t, \frac{\sin\sqrt{\Delta^2 + m}t}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 + m}} \right),$$

then by Duhamel formula the solution of (2.1) can be written as

$$u(t) = \mathcal{W}(t)(u_0, u_1)^T + \int_0^t \mathcal{W}(t-s)(0, F(s))^T\, ds,$$

where $(u_0, u_1)^T$ denote the transpose of vector (u_0, u_1). Now we define the norm of the Strichartz space $W(I)$ as

$$\|u\|_{W(I)} = \sup_{(\rho,\gamma)\in\Lambda} \big\|u\big\|_{L^\rho_t L^\gamma_x}, \tag{2.3}$$

where for any fixed small constant $\delta_0 > 0$,

$$\Lambda = \Big\{(\rho, \gamma) : \ \frac{4}{\rho} + \frac{d}{\gamma} = \frac{d}{2},\ 0 \leq d\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\gamma}\Big) - \frac{2}{\rho} \leq 2,\ \rho \geq 2, \gamma \geq 2 + \delta_0\Big\},$$

and

$$N(I) = L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+2)}{d+4}} \cap L_{t,x}^{\frac{2(d+4)}{d+8}}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.4}$$

Lemma 2.3 (Small data scattering). *There exists a small constant ε_0, such that for any initial data $(u_0,u_1)\in\mathcal{E}$ and for any $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_0$, if*

$$\|\mathcal{W}(\cdot)(u_0,u_1)\|_{S(I)}\le\varepsilon,$$

then there exist constants C_1,C_2 dependent on $\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\mathcal{E}}$, such that the corresponding solution u of (1.1) satisfying

$$\|u\|_{S(I)}\le C_1\varepsilon,\quad \|u\|_{W(I)}\le C_2. \tag{2.5}$$

In particular, u scatters when $I=\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By the Strichartz estimates in Lemma 2.1, one has

$$\|u\|_{S(I)}\lesssim\|\mathcal{W}(\cdot)(u_0,u_1)\|_{S(I)}+\|u\|_{S(I)}^p.$$

The first estimate in (2.5) follows by the bootstrap argument. Moreover, using the Strichartz estimates again, one gives

$$\|u\|_{W(I)}\lesssim\|(u_0,u_1)\|_{\mathcal{E}}+\|u\|_{S(I)}^p.$$

This implies that the second estimate in (2.5) by using the first one. □

Lemma 2.4 ([16]). *Let I be a time interval such that $0\in I$, and let $\tilde u\in C(I;H^2(\mathbb{R}^d))\cap C^1(I;L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be the an almost solution of (1.1) in the sense that*

$$\partial_{tt}\tilde u+\Delta^2\tilde u+m\tilde u+\mu|\tilde u|^{p-1}\tilde u=e$$

with $\big(\tilde u(0),\partial_t\tilde u(0)\big)\in\mathcal{E}$ and $\|\tilde u\|_{S(I)}\le A$. Then there exist $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(A), C=C(A)$ such that for any $0<\varepsilon<\varepsilon_0$, $(u_0,u_1)\in\mathcal{E}$ if

$$\|e\|_{N(I)}\le\varepsilon,\quad \|\mathcal{W}(\cdot)[(u(0),\partial_tu(0))-(\tilde u(0),\partial_t\tilde u(0))]\|_{S(I)}\le\varepsilon,$$

then there exists a unique $u\in C(I;H^2(\mathbb{R}^d))\cap C^1(I;L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ to be the solution of (1.1) with

$$\|u-\tilde u\|_{S(I)}\le C(A)\varepsilon_0;\quad \|u-\tilde u\|_{W(I)}\le C(A).$$

2.2. Profile decomposition.

In this subsection, we recall the linear profile decomposition, and establish some perturbation lemmas between the nonlinear profile and the nonlinear solutions of the beam equation. For the sake of convenience, we may write the free energy $E_0(w)$ instead of $E_0(w,w_t)$. The following version of the linear profile decomposition was essentially given in [16], we omit the proof details here.

Lemma 2.5 ([16]). *Let $\{w_n(t)\}_n$ be a solution sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to linear beam equation such that $E_0(w_n)\le E<\infty$ for all n, then there exist a linear solution sequence $\{V^j\}_j$ which are bounded in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a time-sequence $\{t_n^j\}_{n,j}$, a space-sequence $\{x_n^j\}_{n,j}$, such that*

$$w_n(t)=\sum_{j=1}^M V^j(x+x_n^j,t+t_n^j)+W_n^M(t),$$

where $W_n^M(t)$ be the linear solution of beam equation with

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\|W_n^M\right\|_{W(\mathbb{R})}=0, \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$|x_n^j - x_n^k| + |t_n^j - t_n^k| \to \infty, \ \text{as } n \to \infty, \ \text{when } j \neq k. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover,

$$\|w_n(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \|V^j(t + t_n^j)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + \|W_n^M(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 + o_n(1), \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\|w_n(t)\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{M} \|V^\alpha(t + t_n^j)\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1} + o_{n,M}(1), \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$E_0(w_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} E_0(V^j) + E_0(W_n^M) + o_n(1), \tag{2.10}$$

where $o_n(1) \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *and* $o_{n,M}(1) \to 0$ *as* $n, M \to \infty$.

Definition 2.6. *Let* V *be the linear solution of beam equation which is bounded in* $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, *and* $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ *be a time sequence. We define the nonlinear profile* $\mathcal{U}$ *associated to* $\{V, t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, *if* $\mathcal{U}$ *is the solution of (1.1), and*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\mathcal{U}(\cdot, t_n) - V(\cdot, t_n)\|_{\mathcal{E}} = 0.$$

Remark 2.1. *Let* $\mathcal{U}$ *be the nonlinear profile associated to* $\{V, t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$. *If* $t_n \to t_0$ *for some* $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, *then it is the solution of the following integral equation*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}(t) =& V(t) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathcal{W}(t-s)(0, \mu|\mathcal{U}|^{p-1}\mathcal{U}(s))^T \, ds \\ =& \mathcal{W}(t - t_0)(V(t_0), V_t(t_0))^T + \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathcal{W}(t-s)(0, \mu|\mathcal{U}|^{p-1}\mathcal{U}(s))^T \, ds\end{aligned}$$

If $t_n \to \pm\infty$, *it is the solution of the following integral equation*

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = V(t) + \int_{\pm\infty}^{t} \mathcal{W}(t-s)(0, \mu|\mathcal{U}|^{p-1}\mathcal{U}(s))^T \, ds.$$

One easily verifies that when $t_n \to \pm\infty$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|\mathcal{U}\|_{S(I_n^\pm)} = 0, \quad I_n^+ = [t_n, \infty), \quad I_n^- = (-\infty, t_n]. \tag{2.11}$$

Indeed, If $t_n \to +\infty$ *(similar argument holds for* $t_n \to -\infty$*), then for large* n, *one has*

$$\|V(t)\|_{S(I_n)} = o_n(1).$$

Then by Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\|\mathcal{U}\|_{S([t_n, \infty))} = o_n(1).$$

The following result is a consequence of the stability statement in Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\{w_n(t)\}_n$ be a solution sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to linear beam equation such that $E(w_n) \le E < \infty$ for all n, $\{V^j, x_n^j, t_n^j, W_n^M\}$ be the corresponding linear profiles decomposition obtained in the lemma 2.5. Let $\{\mathcal{U}^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the nonlinear profile of $\{V^j, t_n^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, and u_n be the solutions with the initial data $(u_{0,n}, u_{1,n})$. Then there exists a $M > 0$, such that if $\mathcal{U}^j$ scatters for any $j = 1, \cdots, M$, then u_n scatters.*

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{u}(x,t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{U}^j(x + x_n^j, t + t_n^j) \tag{2.12}$$

where n, M is large and will be determined later. Then $\tilde{u}(x,t)$ is the solution of

$$\partial_{tt}\tilde{u} + \Delta^2\tilde{u} + m\tilde{u} + \mu|\tilde{u}|^{p-1}\tilde{u} = e$$

where

$$e = \mu\Big(|\tilde{u}|^{p-1}\tilde{u} - \sum_{j=1}^{M} |\mathcal{U}^j|^{p-1}\mathcal{U}^j\Big).$$

First, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, (2.8) implies that there exists $M_0 = M_0(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\sum_{j=M_0}^{\infty} \|V^j\|_{H^2}^2 \le \varepsilon. \tag{2.13}$$

This together with Lemma 2.3 yields that

$$\sum_{j=M_0}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{U}^j\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^2 \cap S(\mathbb{R})} \le C\varepsilon. \tag{2.14}$$

Since $\mathcal{U}^j$ scatters for any $j : 1 \le j \le M_0$, making use of (2.12) and (2.14) we obtain for $M \ge M_0$,

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \le A \tag{2.15}$$

for some $A > 0$ independent of M.

Second, we claim that there exist large $n = n(\varepsilon)$ and $M = M(\varepsilon)$, such that

$$\|\mathcal{W}(\cdot)[(u_n(0), \partial_t u_n(0)) - (\tilde{u}(0), \partial_t \tilde{u}(0))]\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \le \varepsilon. \tag{2.16}$$

Indeed, let w_n be the linear solution of beam equation with the initial data $(u_n(0), \partial_t u_n(0))$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}(t)[(u_n(0),&\partial_t u(0)) - (\tilde{u}(0), \partial_t \tilde{u}(0))] \\
&= w_n(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{M} V^j(\cdot + x_n^j, t + t_n^j) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathcal{W}(t)\big(V_n^j(0) - \mathcal{U}_n^j(0)\big) \\
&= W_n^M(t) + \sum_{j<M_0} \mathcal{W}(t)\big(V_n^j(0) - \mathcal{U}_n^j(0)\big) + \sum_{j=M_0}^{M} \mathcal{W}(t)\big(V_n^j(0) - \mathcal{U}_n^j(0)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$V_n^j(t) = V^j(\cdot + x_n^j, t + t_n^j), \qquad \mathcal{U}_n^j(t) = \mathcal{U}^j(\cdot + x_n^j, t + t_n^j).$$

To prove (2.16), one may control the first term by (2.6), the second term by Definition 2.6, and the third term by (2.13) and (2.14).

At last, we show that there exists large $n = n(\varepsilon)$, such that

$$\|e\|_{N(\mathbb{R})} \leq \varepsilon, \tag{2.17}$$

where $N(\mathbb{R})$ is defined by (2.4). From (2.14), we may assume that $M = M_0$. One may verify that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\tilde{u}|^{p-1}\tilde{u}(x,t) - \sum_{j=1}^{M_0} |\mathcal{U}_n^j|^{p-1}\mathcal{U}_n^j(x,t) \\ \lesssim &\sum_{j=1}^{M_0} \left(|\mathcal{U}^j(x',t')|^{p-1} \cdot \sum_{k=1,k\neq j}^{M_0} |\mathcal{U}^k(x' - x_n^k + x_n^j, t' - t_n^k + t_n^j)| \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where $x' = x - x_n^j$, $t' = t - t_n^j$. By Hölder's inequality, one easily get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e\|_{N(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim &\sum_{j=1}^{M_0} \|\mathcal{U}^j\|_{S(\mathbb{R})}^{p-1} \sum_{k=1,k\neq j}^{M_0} \|\mathcal{U}^k(\cdot - x_n^k + x_n^j, \cdot - t_n^k + t_n^j)\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} \\ \to &0, \text{ if } n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where one may assume that $\mathcal{U}^j$ has compact support in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ in the last step since $\mathcal{U}^j \in S(0,\infty)$. This proves (2.17) by choosing $n = n(\varepsilon)$ large enough. The proof of Lemma 2.7 is thus complete from Lemma 2.4. ☐

3. Ground State

In this section, we establish some useful lemmas which play an important role in the study of the focusing beam equation ($\mu = -1$). Indeed, the focusing beam equation (1.1) admits a standing wave of the form $u(x,t) = \varphi(x)$, where φ satisfies

$$\Delta^2\varphi + m\varphi - |\varphi|^{p-1}\varphi = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $\|\varphi\|_{S(\mathbb{R})} = +\infty$, one can not expect to establish an analogous scattering result for the defocusing case as in Theorem 1.2.

First of all, a direct calculation gives us the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let ϕ be any Schwartz function, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi x \cdot \nabla\phi \, dx = -\frac{d}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi|^2 \, dx,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi|^{p-1}\phi x \cdot \nabla\phi \, dx = -\frac{d}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi|^{p+1} \, dx,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta^2\phi x \cdot \nabla\phi \, dx = \Big(2 - \frac{d}{2}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\phi|^2 \, dx.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution of* (3.1)*, then the following two identities hold:*

$$K_1(\varphi) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta\varphi|^2 + m|\varphi|^2\big)\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi|^{p+1}\,dx = 0; \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$K_2(\varphi) \triangleq 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\varphi|^2\,dx - d\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int |\varphi|^{p+1}\,dx = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. We multiply (3.1) by φ and integrate it in $\mathbb{R}^d$ to find the frist identity. The second corresponds to the Pohozaev identity, which is obtained by multiplying $x\cdot\nabla\varphi + \frac{d}{2}\varphi$ in both sides of (3.1), integrating and making use of Lemma 3.1. ☐

Define the Lagrange functional J which corresponds to the equation (3.1) as

$$J(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta\varphi|^2 + m|\varphi|^2\big)\,dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int |\varphi|^{p+1}\,dx.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{X} \triangleq \big\{\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \psi \neq 0, \psi \text{ sloves } (3.1)\big\},$$

then from the least action principle, the set of the ground state of the elliptic equation (3.1) can be defined by

$$\mathcal{G} \triangleq \{\varphi \in \mathcal{X} : J(\varphi) \le J(\psi), \text{ for any } \psi \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

The existence of the ground state was shown in [1], in which the ground state had been shown as a radial, rapidly decaying function. For our purpose, we will give two characterizations of the ground state based on the functional K_1,K_2, which will be important to describe the structures of the dichotomy of blowing up and scattering associated to the nonlinear beam equation. Usually, we only need functional K_2 in this paper, but we also give full analysis on both functionals for convenience.

Lemma 3.3. *For $j = 1, 2$, let*

$$\mathcal{X}_j \triangleq \{\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \psi \neq 0, K_j(\psi) = 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_j \triangleq \{\varphi \in \mathcal{X}_j : J(\varphi) \le J(\psi), \textit{ for any } \psi \in \mathcal{X}_j\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ are non-empty.

In order to prove this lemma, we present the following profile decomposition which is used to compensate the defect of compactness for the bounded set in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We omit the proof and refer to [4, 16] for analogous ones.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a solution sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to linear beam equation such that $\|\psi_n\|_{H^2} \le C_0 < \infty$ for all n, then up to the extraction of a subsequence, there exist families $\{x_n^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ for each n, $\{\psi^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ bounded in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that*

(i) *For each* M,

$$\psi_n = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \psi^j(\cdot - x_n^j) + R_n^M, \tag{3.5}$$

with

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\Big[\lim_{n\to\infty}\|R_n^M\|_{L^{p+1}}\Big] = 0, \ \textit{for any } p \in (1, 2^\sharp - 1). \tag{3.6}$$

(ii) $|x_n^j - x_n^k| \to \infty$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *when* $j \neq k$.

As a consequence of the orthogonality property (ii), one has

$$J(\psi_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} J(\psi^j) + J(R_n^M) + o_n(1), \ \ n \to \infty, \tag{3.7}$$

and for $\ell = 1, 2$,

$$K_\ell(\psi_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} K_\ell(\psi^j) + K_\ell(R_n^M) + o_n(1), \ \ n \to \infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Let

$$\begin{aligned} J_\ell &= \inf\{J(\psi) : \psi \in \mathcal{X}_\ell\} \\ &= \inf\{\widetilde{J}(\psi) = J(\psi) - \frac{1}{4}K_\ell(\psi) : \psi \in \mathcal{X}_\ell\}, \qquad \ell = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

We only prove the non-empty of $\mathcal{G}_2$, since the same argument is also valid to $\mathcal{G}_1$. Then the conclusion follows if functional J_2 reaches minimal in $\mathcal{X}_2$. By a simple computation, we have

$$\widetilde{J}(\psi) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} m|\psi|^2\,dx + \Big(\frac{d}{8} - \frac{d+4}{4(p+1)}\Big)\int |\psi|^{p+1}\,dx. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $p > 1 + \frac{8}{d}$, one easily verifies that $\widetilde{J}(\psi) \geq 0$. Let $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be the minimizing sequence such that $\widetilde{J}(\psi_n) \to J_2$ and $K_2(\psi_n) = 0$. From (3.9) we can assume that $\{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Then by Lemma 3.4, we have the decomposition (3.5) such that (3.7) and (3.8). Now we claim that for any j,

$$K_2(\psi^j) \geq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Suppose for contradiction that there exists j_0 such that $K_2(\psi^{j_0}) < 0$. Then, there exists $\lambda^{j_0} < 1$, such that $K_2(\lambda^{j_0}\psi^{j_0}) = 0$. This together with the definition of J_2 implies that

$$\widetilde{J}(\lambda^{j_0}\psi^{j_0}) \geq J_2.$$

Moreover, from (3.9) one easily gets that

$$\widetilde{J}(\lambda^{j_0}\psi^{j_0}) < \widetilde{J}(\psi^{j_0}), \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \widetilde{J}(\psi^{j_0}) > J_2.$$

On the other hands, since $\widetilde{J}(\psi^j) \geq 0$ for any j and $\lim\limits_{n,M\to\infty}\widetilde{J}(R_n^M) \geq 0$, (3.7) and (3.8) imply that

$$\widetilde{J}(\psi^{j_0}) \leq J_2.$$

This gives a contradiction and thus proves (3.10). Hence, collecting (3.10), (3.8) and $\lim\limits_{n,M\to\infty} K_2(R_n^M) \geq 0$ shows that

$$K_2(\psi^j) = 0, \quad \text{for any } j.$$

This again yields by the definition of J_2 that there exists only one j, taking $j = 1$ without loss of generality, such that

$$\widetilde{J}(\psi^1) = J_2.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.3 is thus complete. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ be defined in* (3.4)*, then*

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_2.$$

Proof. Making use of Lemma 3.3 and the Lagrangian multiplier theory, there exists λ_j, $j = 1, 2$, such that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_j$,

$$J'(\varphi) = \lambda_j K_j'(\varphi), \quad j = 1, 2. \tag{3.11}$$

First, a direct computation implies that for any $f(x) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$K_1'(\varphi)f = 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta\varphi \cdot \Delta f \, dx + 2m \int \varphi \cdot f \, dx - (p+1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi^p f \, dx.$$

Taking $f(x) = \varphi(x)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} K_1'(\varphi)\varphi &= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\varphi|^2 \, dx + 2m \int |\varphi|^2 \, dx - (p+1)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi|^{p+1} \, dx \\ &= \frac{p-1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi|^{p+1} \, dx > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $K_1(\varphi) = 0$ in the second step. But $J'(\varphi)\varphi = 0$ together with (3.11) for $j = 1$ leads to $\lambda_1 = 0$. This shows that $J = J_1$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1$.

Similarly, we have for any $f(x) \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$K_2'(\varphi)f = 4\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Delta\varphi \cdot \Delta f \, dx - d\Big(\frac{p+1}{2} - 1\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi^p f \, dx.$$

Now let $f = x \cdot \nabla\varphi + \frac{d}{2}\varphi$, using $K_2(\varphi) = 0$ and Lemma 3.1, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} K_2'(\varphi)\phi &= 4(2 - \frac{d}{2})\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\varphi|^2 \, dx + d^2\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi|^{p+1} \, dx \\ &= 8\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\varphi|^2 \, dx > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $J'(\varphi)\varphi = 0$ together with (3.11) for $j = 2$ leads to $\lambda_2 = 0$. This implies that $J = J_2$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_2$. □

As a consequence of Lemma 3.5, one will show that the sign of $K_j(u)$ for $j = 1, 2$ is invariant along the nonlinear flow of (1.1) under the restriction $E(u) \triangleq E(u, u_t) < E(R, 0)$.

Corollary 3.6. *The manifolds*

$$\mathcal{A}^+ = \{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : E(u) < E(R), K_1(u) > 0\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}^- = \{u \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : E(u) < E(R), K_1(u) < 0\}$$

are invariant under the nonlinear flow of (1.1)*. That is, if* $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}^\pm$*, then also* $u(t) \in \mathcal{A}^\pm$*, for any* $t \in (-T_-(u_0, u_1), T_+(u_0, u_1))$*.*

Proof. Note that $J(u) \le E(u)$, $J(R) = E(R)$ and $E(u(t)) = E(u(0))$. Since $E(u_0) < E(R)$, then we have

$$J(u(t)) < J(R), \text{ for any } t \in (-T_-(u_0, u_1), T_+(u_0, u_1)).$$

On the other hand, if there exists a time $t_0 \in (-T_-(u_0, u_1), T_+(u_0, u_1))$ such that $K_1(u(t_0)) = 0$, then by Lemma 3.5, $J(u(t_0)) \ge J(R)$. This contradicts $J(u(t)) < J(R)$.

This argument is also valid for other cases, we omit them. □

The following lemma gives an alternative description of the functional $K_j(u)$ for $j = 1, 2$ under the restriction of $E(u) < E(R)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $\psi \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *satisfy* $J(\psi) < J(R)$*, then*

(1) $K_1(\psi) > 0 \iff \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$*;*

(2) $K_1(\psi) < 0 \iff \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2 > \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2$*.*

Proof. It suffice to prove (1), since (2) can be obtained by a similar way. It is easy to check that

$$J(R) = \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta R|^2 + m|R|^2\big)\, dx, \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$J(\psi) - \frac{1}{p+1} K_1(\psi) = \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big) \int \big(|\Delta\psi|^2 + m|\psi|^2\big)\, dx.$$

Therefore, $J(\psi) < J(R)$ and $K_1(\psi) > 0$ immediately lead to

$$\|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2 < \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.13}$$

Next, we prove the converse part. Consider

$$K_1(\lambda\psi) = \lambda^2\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta\psi|^2 + m|\psi|^2\big)\, dx - \lambda^{p-1} \int |\psi|^{p+1}\, dx\Big). \tag{3.14}$$

Choosing $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lambda_0^{p-1} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta\psi|^2\, dx + m|\psi|^2\, dx}{\int \psi^{p+1}\, dx}. \tag{3.15}$$

we have by (3.14)

$$K_1(\lambda_0\psi) = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

This implies that

$$K_1(\psi) > 0 \iff \lambda_0 > 1.$$

On the other hand, by (3.16) and Lemma 3.5, one has

$$J(\lambda_0\psi) \geq J(R). \tag{3.17}$$

From (3.15) and (3.13), one easily shows that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\lambda_0\psi) =&\lambda_0^2\Big(\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\Delta\psi|^2\,dx+\frac{1}{2}m\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\psi|^2\,dx-\lambda_0^{p-1}\frac{1}{p+1}\int\psi^{p+1}\,dx\Big)\\ =&\lambda_0^2\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int\big(|\Delta\psi|^2+m|\psi|^2\big)\,dx\\ <&\lambda_0^2\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int\big(|\Delta R|^2+m|R|^2\big)\,dx\\ =&\lambda_0^2J(R). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

This together with (3.17) to give that $\lambda_0 > 1$ and thus $K_1(\psi) > 0$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 3.7. ☐

Remark 3.1. *By a similar argument, one may find that if* $E(u) < E(R)$*, then* $K_1(u)\cdot K_2(u) > 0$.

By Lemma 3.7 , one may rewrite the manifolds $\mathcal{A}^{\pm}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^+ &= \{u\in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d): E(u)<E(R), \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2+m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2<\|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2+m\|R\|_{L^2}^2\};\\ \mathcal{A}^- &= \{u\in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d): E(u)<E(R), \|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2+m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2>\|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2+m\|R\|_{L^2}^2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Now, we need a stronger result than Corollary 3.6, this is important in the local virial analysis. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^+_{\delta,\bar\delta} \triangleq \big\{u \in &H^2(\mathbb{R}^d): E(u)<(1-\delta)E(R), K_1(u)>\bar\delta\max\{\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+m\|u\|_{L^2}^2, \|u\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}\}\\ &K_2(u)>\bar\delta\max\{\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2, \|u\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}\}\big\};\\ \mathcal{A}^-_{\delta,\bar\delta} \triangleq \big\{u \in &H^2(\mathbb{R}^d): E(u)<(1-\delta)E(R), K_1(u)<-\bar\delta\max\{\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+m\|u\|_{L^2}^2, \|u\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}\}\\ &K_2(u)<-\bar\delta\max\{\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2, \|u\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}\}\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.8. *Let* $\psi\in H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$*. If* $\psi\in\mathcal{A}^{\pm}_{\delta,0}$*, then there exists some* $\bar\delta\in(0,1)$ *independent of* ψ*, such that* $\psi\in\mathcal{A}^{\pm}_{\delta,\bar\delta}$.

Proof. It suffice to consider the case $\psi\in\mathcal{A}^+_{\delta,0}$, a similar argument holds for the case $\psi\in\mathcal{A}^-_{\delta,0}$. We also note that for $\mathcal{A}^+_{\delta,0}$, we only prove

$$K_1(\psi)>\bar\delta\max\{\|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2+m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2, \|\psi\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}\}, \tag{3.20}$$

since the other one is followed by similar way again. Moreover, keeping in mind that $K_1(\psi) > 0$, the proof of (3.20) can be reduced to show

$$K_1(\psi)>\bar\delta\big(\|\Delta\psi\|_{L^2}^2+m\|\psi\|_{L^2}^2\big). \tag{3.21}$$

We suppose for contradiction that there exists a sequence $\{\psi_n\}_n^\infty$, and a sequence $\{\bar{\delta}_n\}_n^\infty$ satisfying $\bar{\delta}_n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, such that

$$J(\psi_n) < (1-\delta)J(R), \quad 0 < K_1(\psi_n) \leq \bar{\delta}_n\big(\|\Delta\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2\big).$$

The later implies that

$$\|\psi_n\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1} < \|\Delta\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-\bar{\delta}_n}\|\psi_n\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1}.$$

Therefore, there exists λ_n, such that

$$K_1(\lambda_n\psi_n) = 0, \text{ where } 1 < \lambda_n^{p-1} < \frac{1}{1-\bar{\delta}_n}.$$

We have by Lemma 3.5,

$$J(\lambda_n\psi_n) \geq J(R).$$

This means that

$$\frac{1}{2}\big(\|\Delta\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2\big) - \lambda_n^{p-1}\frac{1}{p+1}\|\psi_n\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1} \geq \frac{J(R)}{\lambda_n^2}.$$

On the other hand, we rewrite $J(\psi_n) < (1-\delta)J(R)$ explicitly as

$$\frac{1}{2}\big(\|\Delta\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|\psi_n\|_{L^2}^2\big) - \frac{1}{p+1}\|\psi_n\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1} < (1-\delta)J(R).$$

Compared with the above inequalities, we obtain that

$$0 < (\lambda_n^{p-1} - 1)\frac{1}{p+1}\|\psi_n\|_{L_x^{p+1}}^{p+1} < (1 - \delta - \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2})J(R).$$

But it is impossible when n is large enough, since $\lambda_n \downarrow 1$ as $n \to \infty$. □

Combining the energy conservation, Corollary 3.6 with Proposition 3.8, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3.9. *If $u_0 \in \mathcal{A}^\pm$, then there exist some $\delta, \bar{\delta} \in (0,1)$ depending on u_0, such that the corresponding solution $u(t) \in \mathcal{A}^\pm_{\delta,\bar{\delta}}$ for any $t \in (-T_-(u_0,u_1), T_+(u_0,u_1))$.*

4. Blow up

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3 (b). The argument is based on Glassey's Convexity method [2].

We argue for contradiction that there exists a global solution u such that

$$E(u(t)) = E(u_0,u_1) < E(R), \quad \|\Delta u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 > \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.1}$$

By Corollary 3.9, it follows that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$E(u(t)) < E(R), \quad \|\Delta u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u(t)\|_{L^2}^2 > \|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Let

$$y(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(t)|^2\,dx,$$

then a direct computation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} y'(t) &= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} uu_t\,dx, \\ y''(t) &= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big[|u_t|^2 - \big(|\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2 - |u|^{p+1}\big)\Big]\,dx \\ &= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big[|u_t|^2 - K_1(u)\big]\,dx. \end{aligned}$$

By making use of Corollary 3.9 and (4.1), one easily shows that

$$\begin{aligned} y''(t) \geq & 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big[|u_t|^2 + \bar{\delta}(\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|u\|_{L^2}^2)\big]\,dx \\ \geq & 2\bar{\delta}(\|\Delta R\|_{L^2}^2 + m\|R\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$y(t) \to +\infty, \text{ as } t \to \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Therefore, there exists a large time t_0 such that

$$y(t_0) \neq 0, \quad y'(t_0) > 0.$$

On the other hand, since

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{p+1}\,dx = (p+1)E(u_0, u_1) - \frac{p+1}{2}\int \big(|u_t|^2 + |\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2\big)\,dx,$$

one rewrite $y''(t)$ to find that

$$y''(t) = 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big[\frac{p+3}{2}|u_t|^2 + \frac{p-1}{2}\big(|\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2\big)\Big]\,dx - 2(p+1)E(u_0, u_1).$$

Since $E(R) = J(R)$, (3.12) and the assumption (4.1) will lead to

$$E(u_0, u_1) = E(u(t)) < E(R) = J(R) = \frac{p-1}{2(p+1)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\Delta R|^2 + m|R|^2)dx.$$

Hence, from Corollary 3.6 and Lemma 3.7, we obtain that

$$\frac{p-1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2\big)\,dx - (p+1)E(u_0, u_1) \geq 0.$$

This gives us that

$$y''(t) \geq (p+3)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_t|^2\,dx.$$

This together Hölder's inequality leads to

$$y''(t)y(t) \geq \frac{p+3}{4}\big(y'(t)\big)^2.$$

Let $C_0 = y'(t_0)/y^{\frac{p+3}{4}}(t_0)$, one gets

$$y'(t) \geq C_0 y^{\frac{p+3}{4}}(t).$$

Since $\frac{p+3}{4} > 1$, this leads to the finite time blow-up with

$$T_-(u_0, u_1),\ \ T_+(u_0, u_1) \le t_0 + \frac{4}{p-1}\cdot\frac{y(t_0)}{y'(t_0)}.$$

This is a contradiction with global well-posedness, and the proof of Theorem 1.3 (b) is thus complete.

5. Concentration-compactness and the minimal element

From this section, we begin to prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3(a). For simplicity, we only consider the case of positive direction. By the profile decomposition in Section 2.2, we argue that if the scattering results in Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3(a) do not hold, then there must exist a minimal energy solution or the least action solution with infinite S-norm. Meanwhile, as an extremal, the minimal element enjoys some good compactness properties. To this end, we carry out the inductive argument as follows.

By the small data theory in Lemma 2.3, there exists δ_{sd}, such that if

$$\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\mathcal{E}} \le \delta_{sd},$$

then the corresponding solution u of (1.1) scatters. Now we define the maximal energy

$$\begin{aligned} E^+_{max} =& \sup\big\{E = E(u_0,u_1) > 0 : \|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} < \infty\big\};\\ E^-_{max} =& \sup\Big\{E = E(u_0,u_1) > 0 : \|\Delta u_0\|^2_{L^2} + m\|u_0\|^2_{L^2} < \|\Delta R\|^2_{L^2} + m\|R\|^2_{L^2},\\ & \qquad\qquad \|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} < \infty\ \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E_{max} = \begin{cases} E^+_{max}, & \text{if } \mu = 1,\\ E^-_{max}, & \text{if } \mu = -1. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

In particular, by Lemma 3.7, one may rewrite E^-_{max} for the focusing case $\mu = -1$ as follows

$$E^-_{max} = \sup\Big\{E = E(u_0,u_1) > 0 : K_1(u_0) > 0, \|u\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} < \infty\Big\}$$

Moreover, it is easy to verify that

$$E(u,u_t) - \frac{1}{p+1}K_1(u) = \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int \big(|\Delta u|^2 + m|u|^2\big)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t^2\,dx. \tag{5.2}$$

This gives a uniform bound of the solution in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Thus, by the small data theory above, if

$$E(u_0,u_1) < \delta_{sd}, \quad K_1(u_0) > 0,$$

then u scatters. This tells us that the definition in (5.1) is well-defined. Moreover, Theorem 1.2 or Theorem 1.3(a) hold true if and only if

$$E^+_{max} = \infty, \quad \text{or} \quad E^-_{max} = E(R,0),$$

respectively. Now we suppose for contradiction that

$$E^+_{max} < \infty \quad (\ \text{or } E^-_{max} < E(R,0)\ ). \tag{5.3}$$

The main result in this section is the following.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that E_{max} satisfies (5.3). Then there exists an extreme element*

$$u_c(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$$

such that

$$E(u_c) = E_{max}, \text{ and } \quad \|u_c\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} = \infty.$$

Moreover, there exists a position function $x(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$K = \Big\{ \big(u_c(x - x(t), t), \partial_t u_c(x - x(t), t)\big) : t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \Big\} \text{ is precompact in } \mathcal{E}. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let $\{u_n(t)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a minimizing sequence such that

$$E(u_n, \partial_t u_n) \downarrow E^+_{max}, \text{ and } \quad \|u_n\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} = \infty, \qquad (\text{ defocusing }) \tag{5.5}$$

or

$$\begin{cases} E(u_n, \partial_t u_n) \downarrow E^-_{max}, \text{ and } \quad \|u_n\|_{S(\mathbb{R}^+)} = \infty, \\ \|\Delta u_n\|^2_{L^2} + m\|u_n\|^2_{L^2} < \|\Delta R\|^2_{L^2} + m\|R\|^2_{L^2}, \end{cases} \qquad (\text{ focusing }) \tag{5.6}$$

From (1.2) in the defocusing case or (5.2) in the focusing case, we easily see that u_n is global, i.e.

$$u_n(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)), \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\{w_n\}$ be the solution sequence to the linear beam equation with the initial data $(u_n(0), \partial_t u_n(0))$. By the linear profile decomposition in Lemma 2.5, we have

$$w_n(t) = \sum_{j=1}^M V^j(x + x^j_n, t + t^j_n) + W^M_n(t).$$

Let $\{\mathcal{U}^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be the nonlinear profile associated to $\{V^j, t^j_n\}_{j=1}^\infty$, then by (2.10) and the energy conservation law one has

$$E(u_n) = \sum_{j=1}^M E(\mathcal{U}^j) + E\big(\widetilde{W^M_n}\big) + o_n(1), \tag{5.7}$$

where $\widetilde{W^M_n}$ is the solution of (1.1) with initial data $(W^M_n(0), \partial_t W^M_n(0))$.

We first claim that

$$E(\mathcal{U}^j) \le E_{max}. \tag{5.8}$$

It is a direct consequence of (5.7) for the case $\mu = 1$.

For the case $\mu = -1$, making use of (2.8) for $s = 0, 2$ and the invariance of the manifold $\mathcal{A}^+$ under the nonlinear flow determined by (1.1), we obtain that for any $j \ge 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\|\Delta \mathcal{U}^j(t)\|^2_{L^2} + m\|\mathcal{U}^j(t)\|^2_{L^2} < \|\Delta R\|^2_{L^2} + m\|R\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{5.9}$$

This implies that by Lemma 3.7

$$K_1(\mathcal{U}^j) > 0, \text{ for any } j \ge 1.$$

Thus, by (5.2), one finds that $E(\mathcal{U}^j) \ge 0$. This together with (5.7) implies (5.8).

Now we split it into two cases.

Case 1: $E(\mathcal{U}^j) < E_{max}$ for any $j \geq 1$. From (5.9) and the definition of E_{max}, one infers that

$$\mathcal{U}^j \text{ scatters for any } j \geq 1.$$

Then by Lemma 2.7, u_n scatters. This is a contradiction with the original hypothesis.

Case 2: There exists one j_0, taking $j_0 = 1$ without loss of generality, such that

$$E(\mathcal{U}^1) = E_{max}.$$

Since $E(\mathcal{U}^j) \geq 0$ for any $j \geq 1$, one gets

$$\mathcal{U}^j = 0, \quad \text{for} \quad j \geq 2.$$

If $\mathcal{U}^1$ scatters, then by Lemma 2.7, u_n scatters. It is a contradiction. This shows us that $\mathcal{U}^1$ is exactly the critical solution satisfying the inductive hypothesis. Moreover, one has $t_n^1 = 0$ after adjusting the profile suitably. Otherwise, if $t_n^1 \to \pm\infty$, since

$$w_n(t) = V^1(x + x_n^1, t + t_n^1) + W_n^M(t),$$

one gets that for any $T < +\infty$,

$$\|w_n\|_{S([T,+\infty))} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

To prove the compactness, one may consider any time sequence $\{t_n\}$ for instead, and an almost same process as above gives the compactness result. The details are omitted here. $\square$

As a consequence of this proposition, one concludes that for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $C(\eta)$, such that

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|>C(\eta)} \Big(|\Delta u_c|^2 + m|u_c|^2 + |\partial_t u_c|^2 \Big)\, dx \leq \eta. \tag{5.10}$$

Remark 5.1. *By suitably smoothing out the parameters, one may assume that $x(\cdot)$ is smooth and satisfies*

$$|x'(t)| \lesssim 1. \tag{5.11}$$

For the proof details one may refer [16]*. For the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, one may expect a better estimate on $|x'(t)|$, i.e., $|x'(t)| = o(1)$, by using the Galilean transform and a virial-type identity. However, for the nonlinear beam equation, it lacks the invariance of the Galilean transform. Moreover, the analogous virial-type identity is weaker than the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. It seems that the argument to control $x(t)$ as in the Schrödinger equation does not work to the nonlinear beam equation. In this paper, we overcome these difficulties by introducing a gauge transformation, which will be presented in the following section.*

As the end of this section, we present the following corollary which was proved in [16].

Corollary 5.2. *Let $u(t) \in C(\mathbb{R}; H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be a solution of (1.1) such that the set K defined in (5.4) is precompact in $\mathcal{E}$, and $E(u) \neq 0$. For every $\tau > 0$, there exists two positive numbers $c(\tau, u)$ and $C(\tau, u)$ such that, for all times t, there holds that*

$$c \leq \int_t^{t+\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(s,x)|^{p+1} dxds \leq C. \tag{5.12}$$

In particular, there holds that $\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{p+1} dxds \sim t$.

6. A GAUGE TRANSFORMATION

In this section we give a gauge transformation and establish a series of useful estimates on it. Let u be the solution of (1.1), and define

$$v(x,t) = \mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u(x,t) = e^{i\int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{L^2}^{-2}\,ds + ix\cdot\xi_0} u(x,t), \tag{6.1}$$

where $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will be determined later. It is easy to see that this gauge transformation has its inverse transformation as

$$u(x,t) = \mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}^{-1} v(x,t) = e^{-i\int_0^t \|v(s)\|_{L^2}^{-2}\,ds - ix\cdot\xi_0} v(x,t). \tag{6.2}$$

For simplicity, we denote

$$y(t) = \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{-2} \tag{6.3}$$

in the following context.

Lemma 6.1. *Fix $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then the transformation $\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}$ maps $H^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself. More precisely, one has*

1. $\|\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u\|_{L^2} = \|u\|_{L^2}$;
2. $\|\nabla \mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u\|_{L^2}^2 = |\xi_0|^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$;
3. $\|\Delta \mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u\|_{L^2}^2 = |\xi_0|^4 \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + 2|\xi_0|^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + 4\|\xi_0 \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2$;
4. *If $\inf\limits_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2} \gtrsim 1$, then $\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}$ further maps $\mathcal{E}$ to itself, such that*

$$\|\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u_t\|_{L^2}^2 = y^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Now, we are expecting to understand that the solution would go forward under the gauge transformation.

Lemma 6.2. *Let u be the solution of (1.1), then $\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0} u$ be the solution of the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{tt} v + \Delta^2 v + \mathcal{L}(v) + mv + \mu |v|^{p-1} v = 0, \\ v(0) = e^{ix\cdot\xi_0} u_0,\ v_t(0) = e^{ix\cdot\xi_0}\Big(\dfrac{u_0}{\|u_0\|_2^2} + u_1(x)\Big), \end{cases} \tag{6.4}$$

where the lower order term $\mathcal{L}(v)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(v) = &-2iyv_t - i\dot{y}v - 4i\xi_0\cdot\nabla\Delta v - 4(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2 v \\ &- 2|\xi_0|^2 \Delta v + 4i|\xi_0|^2 \xi_0 \cdot \nabla v + |\xi_0|^4 v - y^2 v. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(iy+\partial_t)u(x,t);\\
\partial_{tt}\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(-y^2+2iy\partial_t+iy_t+\partial_{tt})u(x,t);\\
\nabla\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(i\xi_0+\nabla)u(x,t);\\
\Delta\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(-|\xi_0|^2+2i\xi_0\cdot\nabla+\Delta)u(x,t);\\
(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(-|\xi_0|^4+2i|\xi_0|^2\xi_0\cdot\nabla+(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2)u(x,t);\\
\nabla\Delta\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(-i\xi_0|\xi_0|^2-2\xi_0(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)-|\xi_0|^2\nabla\\
&+i\xi_0\Delta+2i(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)\nabla+\nabla\Delta)u(x,t);\\
\Delta^2\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u =& e^{i\int_0^t y(s)\,ds+ix\cdot\xi_0}(|\xi_0|^4-4i|\xi_0|^2\xi_0\cdot\nabla-2|\xi_0|^2\Delta-4(\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2\\
&+4i\xi_0\cdot\nabla\Delta+\Delta^2)u(x,t).
\end{aligned}$$

These show that $v(t)$ solves the Cauchy problem (6.4). □

Now, we employ the scaling transformation e as

$$w(x,t)=\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u(x.t)=\lambda^{-\frac{4}{p-1}}\mathscr{G}_{\xi_0}u\big(\frac{x}{\lambda},\frac{t}{\lambda^2}\big),$$

then $w(t)$ satisfies the following equation

$$\partial_{tt}w+\Delta^2w+\mathcal{L}_\lambda(w)+m\lambda^4w+\mu|w|^{p-1}w=0, \tag{6.5}$$

where the lower term

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_\lambda(w)=&-2iy\lambda^2w_t-i\dot{y}\lambda^4w-4i\lambda\xi_0\cdot\nabla\Delta w-4(\lambda\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2w\\
&-2|\lambda\xi_0|^2\Delta w+4i|\lambda\xi_0|^2\lambda\xi_0\cdot\nabla w+|\lambda\xi_0|^4w-y^2\lambda^4w.
\end{aligned}\tag{6.6}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let* $\alpha=d-\frac{8}{p-1}$ *and let* $w=\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u$*, then*

1. $\|\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u\|_{L^2}^2=\lambda^\alpha\|u\|_{L^2}^2$;
2. $\|\nabla\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u\|_{L^2}^2=\lambda^{-2+\alpha}\big(|\xi_0|^2\|u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\big)$;
3. $\|\Delta\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u\|_{L^2}^2=\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(|\xi_0|^4\|u\|_{L^2}^2+2|\xi_0|^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+4\|\xi_0\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2\big)$;
4. $\|\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1}=\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\|u\|_{L^{p+1}}^{p+1}$;
5. *Assume*
$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\|u(t)\|_{L^2}\gtrsim 1, \tag{6.7}$$
then $\|\partial_t\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u\|_{L^2}^2=\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(y^2\|u\|_{L^2}^2+\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2\big)$.
6. *Let* $P(w)=Re\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}w_t\nabla\bar{w}\,dx$*, then*
$$P(w)=\lambda^{-3+\alpha}\big(y\xi_0\|u\|_{L^2}^2+P(u_0)\big)=\lambda^{-3+\alpha}\big(\xi_0+P(u_0)\big).$$

Remark 6.1. *The condition* (6.7) *is not trivial, since the solution of linear beam equation lacks the mass conservation. For example, it is not a trivial solution which solves the equation* (2.1) *with the initial data*

$$u(0)=0,\quad \partial_tu(0)=u_1\neq 0.$$

In particular, Let $\xi_0 = -P(u_0)$, then

$$P(w) = 0, \qquad w = \mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0} u. \tag{6.8}$$

Applying (3) and (4) in Lemma 6.3 to the focusing case $\mu = -1$, one gets that

$$K_2(\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0} u) \geq \lambda^{-4+\alpha} K_2(u). \tag{6.9}$$

Let u_c be the critical element obtained in Proposition 5.1, then by the compactness property (5.10), the inverse transform (6.2), one can verify the following results on $\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0} u_c$ by simple computation.

Lemma 6.4. *Let* $\alpha = d - \frac{8}{p-1}$,

$$\tilde{x}(t) = \lambda x(\lambda^{-2} t), \tag{6.10}$$

and let $w_c = \mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0} u_c$, *then for* $\lambda \leq 1$, *one has*

$$\int_{|x-\tilde{x}(t)|>\lambda C(\eta)} |w_c|^2 \, dx \leq \lambda^{\alpha} \eta; \tag{6.11}$$

$$\int_{|x-\tilde{x}(t)|>\lambda C(\eta)} |\nabla w_c|^2 \, dx \leq \lambda^{-2+\alpha} \eta; \tag{6.12}$$

$$\int_{|x-\tilde{x}(t)|>\lambda C(\eta)} \Big(|\Delta w_c|^2 + |\partial_t w_c|^2 \Big) \, dx \leq \lambda^{-4+\alpha} \eta. \tag{6.13}$$

7. THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we will complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 by making use of the critical element given in Proposition 5.1. For simplicity, we omit the subscript and denote u as u_c in the whole section.

7.1. The case $P(u_0) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_1 \nabla u_0 \, dx = 0$.

This situation is much simpler, and we can directly use the local virial argument, see [16] for example. To this end, we set $z(t) = x - x(t)$ and let the function χ_R be defined as in Page 4. We define

$$I_u(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_R(z) z \cdot \nabla u(x,t) u_t(x,t) \, dx, \tag{7.1}$$

and

$$J_u(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_R(z) u(x,t) u_t(x,t) \, dx. \tag{7.2}$$

Then we have the following local virial identity.

Lemma 7.1.

$$\begin{aligned} I_u'(t) = & -\frac{d}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_t|^2 \, dx + \big(\frac{d}{2} - 2\big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta u|^2 \, dx + \frac{md}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^2 \, dx \\ & + \frac{\mu d}{p+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{p+1} \, dx + \mathcal{R}_{I,u}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$J_u'(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(|u_t|^2 - |\Delta u|^2 - mu^2 - \mu|u|^{p+1}\big)\,dx + \mathcal{R}_{J,u},$$

where for $R \gtrsim 1$*,*

$$|\mathcal{R}_{I,u}|, |\mathcal{R}_{J,u}| \lesssim \int_{|x-x(t)|>R} \big(|\Delta u|^2 + |u_t|^2 + |u|^{p+1} + |u|^2\big)\,dx.$$

Proof. It follows by a directly calculation, see [16] for example. □

From Lemma 7.1, one obtains that

$$I_u'(t) + \frac{d}{2}J_u'(t) = -2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta u|^2\,dx - \mu d\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int |u|^{p+1}\,dx + \mathcal{R}_{I,u} + \mathcal{R}_{J,u}. \tag{7.3}$$

In particular, in the case $\mu = -1$, we rewrite (7.3) as

$$I_u'(t) + \frac{d}{2}J_u'(t) = -K_2(u) + \mathcal{R}_{I,u} + \mathcal{R}_{J,u},$$

where the functional K_2 is defined in (3.3). As a direct consequence of (5.10), one may find that for any $\eta > 0$, there exists a large $R = R(\eta)$, such that

$$|\mathcal{R}_{I,u}|, |\mathcal{R}_{J,u}| \le \eta.$$

Combining this with Corollary 3.9, one gets that both for $\mu = \pm 1$,

$$I_u'(t) + \frac{d}{2}J_u'(t) \le -\bar{\delta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u|^{p+1}\,dx + \eta.$$

This, together with Lemma 5.2 and taking η small enough, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_u(t) + \frac{d}{2}J_u(t) &\le -\big(c\bar{\delta} - \eta\big)t + I_u(0) + \frac{d}{2}J_u(0) \\ &\to -\infty, \text{ as } t \to +\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

for both cases $\mu = 1$ and $\mu = -1$.

On the other hand, (5.2) implies that there exists $B = B(E_{max})$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|(u, u_t)\|_{\mathcal{E}}^2 \le B(E_{max}). \tag{7.5}$$

Thus by the definitions (7.1) and (7.2), one has

$$|I_u(t) + \frac{d}{2}J_u(t)| \lesssim R(\eta)B(E_{max}).$$

But this is in contradiction with (7.4). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 in the case $P(u_0) = 0$.

7.2. The case $P(u_0) \neq 0$.

In this subsection, we only need to consider the reminder case $P(u_0) \neq 0$.

7.2.1. *Some virial identities on* $\mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u_c$. We denote $w_c = \mathscr{G}_{\lambda,\xi_0}u_c$, which is a solution of (6.5). Moreover, we omit the subscript again and denote u as u_c, w as w_c for simplicity. By making use of the conservation law (1.3), Hölder's inequality and (7.5), we have

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|u(t)\|_{L^2} \gtrsim |P(u_0)|^2/B(E_{max})^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{7.6}$$

This gives that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$y(t) \le B(E_{max})^3/|P(u_0)|^4, \qquad \text{where } y(t) = \|u(t)\|_{L^2}^{-2}. \tag{7.7}$$

Thus, $(w, \partial_t w) \in \mathcal{E}$ by Lemma 6.3.

Let $\tilde{z}(t) = x - \tilde{x}(t)$. Define

$$I_w(t) = \mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z}\cdot\nabla\bar{w}(x,t)w_t(x,t)\,dx. \tag{7.8}$$

Then we have the following identity.

Lemma 7.2. *Let* $\xi_0 = P(u_0)$ *and* $\lambda \le 1$. *Then for any* $\eta > 0$, *one may find a large* $R = R(\eta)$ *with* $\lambda R \ge 1$, *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} I_w'(t) = -\frac{d}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |w_t|^2\,dx + \big(\frac{d}{2}-2\big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta w|^2\,dx \\ + \frac{md}{2}\lambda^4\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |w|^2\,dx + \frac{\mu d}{p+1}\int |w|^{p+1}\,dx + \mathcal{R}_{I,w}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|\mathcal{R}_{I,w}| \lesssim \lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(\eta + \lambda + \lambda^7 R\big).$$

Proof. By a direct calculation, we have

$$I_w'(t) = \mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z})\cdot\nabla\bar{w}(x,t)w_t(x,t)\,dx \tag{7.9}$$

$$+\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z}\cdot\nabla\bar{w}_t(x,t)w_t(x,t)\,dx \tag{7.10}$$

$$+\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z}\cdot\nabla\bar{w}(x,t)w_{tt}(x,t)\,dx. \tag{7.11}$$

Since

$$\partial_t(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z}) = -\tilde{x}'(t)\cdot(\nabla\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z} + \chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})),$$

by (6.8) one gets

$$(7.9) = -\tilde{x}'(t)\cdot\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z})\tilde{z} + \chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde{z}) - 1)\nabla\bar{w}(x,t)w_t(x,t)\,dx.$$

Thus, collecting (6.12),(6.13), (5.11), and then by choosing $R = R(\eta)$ large enough, one has by $\lambda < 1$

$$|(7.9)| \lesssim |\tilde{x}'(t)|\int_{|x-\tilde{x}(t)|>\lambda R} |\nabla\bar{w}(x,t)|\,|w_t(x,t)|\,dx \lesssim \eta\lambda^{-4+\alpha}. \tag{7.12}$$

Note that

$$(7.10) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla\cdot(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z)|w_t|^2\,dx = -\frac{d}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|w_t|^2\,dx + \mathcal{R}, \tag{7.13}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R} = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big[\nabla\cdot(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z) - d\big]|w_t|^2\,dx.$$

We easily obtain that

$$|\mathcal{R}| \lesssim \int_{|x-\tilde x(t)|>\lambda R}|w_t(x,t)|^2\,dx \lesssim \eta\lambda^{-4+\alpha}. \tag{7.14}$$

To estimate (7.11), we make use of (6.5) to get

$$\begin{aligned}(7.11) =&\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w(x,t)\big(-\Delta^2 w - m\lambda^4 w - \mathcal{L}_\lambda w - \mu|w|^{p-1}w\big)dx\\ =&\Big(\frac{d}{2}-2\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\Delta w|^2\,dx + \frac{md}{2}\lambda^4\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|w|^2\,dx + \frac{\mu d}{p+1}\int|w|^{p+1}\,dx\\ &-\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w(x,t)\mathcal{L}_\lambda w\,dx + \mathcal{R},\end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

where $\lambda R \ge 1$, the remainder term $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies

$$|\mathcal{R}| \lesssim \int_{|x-\tilde x(t)|>\lambda R}\big(|\Delta w|^2 + |w|^{p+1} + |w|^2\big)\,dx \lesssim \eta\lambda^{-4+\alpha}. \tag{7.16}$$

Now we consider the term $-\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\mathcal{L}_\lambda w\,dx$. Denote $\mathcal{R}$ the remainder term, which may vary from line to line, but has the same estimate as (7.16). By the definition (6.6), we estimate it term by term. By variable transformation, we replace w by the original function u and use (7.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} iy\lambda^2\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w w_t\,dx\\ &\qquad = -d\lambda^{-1+\alpha}y^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|u|^2\,dx + 2\lambda^{-1+\alpha}y\xi_0\cdot\partial_t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_R(z)z\,|u|^2\,dx + \mathcal{R}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

Similarly,

$$2\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} i\dot y\lambda^4\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w w\,dx = \lambda^{3+\alpha}\dot y\xi_0\cdot\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_R(z)z\,u^2\,dx.$$

Since $\dot y(t)$ is uniformly bounded, one has

$$\Big|2\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} i\dot y\lambda^4\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w w\,dx\Big| \lesssim \lambda^{3+\alpha}\mathcal{R}. \tag{7.18}$$

By integrating by parts and similarly estimating as above, one obtains that

$$4\lambda\xi_0\cdot\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} i\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\nabla\Delta w\,dx = (6-2d)\lambda\xi_0\cdot\mathrm{Im}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\bar w\Delta w\,dx + \mathcal{R}. \tag{7.19}$$

Similarly,

$$4\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\;(\lambda\xi_0\cdot\nabla)^2 w\,dx=-(4-2d)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\lambda\xi_0\cdot\nabla w|^2\,dx+\mathcal{R}\le\mathcal{R},\tag{7.20}$$

and

$$2|\lambda\xi_0|^2\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\;\Delta w\,dx=-(2-d)|\lambda\xi_0|^2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\nabla w|^2\,dx+\mathcal{R}\le\mathcal{R}.\tag{7.21}$$

Meanwhile, we also have

$$-4|\lambda\xi_0|^2\lambda\xi_0\cdot\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}i\big(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\big)\;\nabla w\,dx=-2(d-1)|\lambda\xi_0|^2\lambda\xi_0\cdot\mathrm{Im}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\bar w\nabla w\,dx,\tag{7.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(-|\lambda\xi_0|^4+\lambda^4y^2\big)\lambda\xi_0\cdot\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}i\big(\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\big)\;\nabla w\,dx\\&=-\frac{d}{2}\big(-|\lambda\xi_0|^4+\lambda^4y^2\big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|w|^2\,dx.\end{aligned}\tag{7.23}$$

Therefore, putting (7.17)–(7.23) together with (7.7), we have by Lemma 6.3

$$\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\tilde z\cdot\nabla\bar w\mathcal{L}_\lambda w\,dx\le\mathcal{R}_{I,w},\tag{7.24}$$

where

$$|\mathcal{R}_{I,w}|\lesssim\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(\eta+\lambda+\lambda^7R\big),\qquad\lambda\le1.\tag{7.25}$$

Collecting (7.12), (7.13), (7.15) with (7.24), and using the estimates (7.14), (7.16), and (7.25), we finish the proof of Lemma 7.2. □

Now we define the second quantity

$$J_w(t)=\mathrm{Re}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\chi_{\lambda R}(\tilde z)\bar w(x,t)w_t(x,t)\,dx.\tag{7.26}$$

Then by a similar computation as in the proof of Lemma 7.2, we have the following identity.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\xi_0=P(u_0)$ and $\lambda\le1$. Then for any $\eta>0$, one may find a large $R=R(\eta)$ with $\lambda R\ge1$, such that*

$$J_w'(t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(|w_t|^2-|\Delta w|^2-m\lambda^4|w|^2-\mu|w|^{p+1}\big)\,dx+\mathcal{R}_{J,w},$$

where

$$|\mathcal{R}_{J,w}|\lesssim\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(\eta+\lambda\big).$$

7.2.2. *Conclusion.* Now we are in position to prove the main theorems under the assumption of $P(u_0)\neq 0$. First, we combine Lemma 7.2 with 7.3 to obtain

$$I'_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J'_w(t)=-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\Delta w|^2\,dx-\mu d\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p+1}\Big)\int|w|^{p+1}\,dx+\mathcal{R}_{I,w}+\frac{d}{2}\mathcal{R}_{J,w}. \tag{7.27}$$

In particular, when $\mu=-1$, we can rewrite the above as

$$I'_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J'_w(t)=-K_2(w)+\mathcal{R}_{I,w}+\mathcal{R}_{J,w}.$$

Therefore, no matter if $\mu=1$ or $\mu=-1$, by (6.9), one has

$$I'_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J'_w(t)\leq-\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|u(t)|^{p+1}\,dx+\mathcal{R}_{I,w}+\mathcal{R}_{J,w}.$$

Similar to the derivation as in Subsection 7.1, we infer that by Corollary 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned}I_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J_w(t)\leq&-\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\bar{\delta}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|u(x,t')|^{p+1}\,dxdt'\\&+C\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big(\eta+\lambda+\lambda^7R\big)t+I_u(0)+\frac{d}{2}J_u(0)\\\leq&\lambda^{-4+\alpha}\big[c\bar{\delta}-C(\eta+\lambda+\lambda^7R)\big]t+I_u(0)+\frac{d}{2}J_u(0).\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\lambda R\sim 1$ and choosing R large enough, we obtain

$$I_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J_w(t)\to-\infty,\ \text{as } t\to+\infty. \tag{7.28}$$

On the other hand, by the definitions of $I_w(t)$ and $J_w(t)$, there exists $B(R,E_{max})>0$, such that

$$\Big|I_w(t)+\frac{d}{2}J_w(t)\Big|\lesssim B(R,E_{max}).$$

This contradicts (7.28). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgement: C. Miao was partly supported by the NSF of China (No.10725102), and Y. Wu was supported by China postdoctoral science foundation project.

References

[1] G. Fibich, B. Ilan and G. Papanicolaou, Self-focusing with fourth order dispersion, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 62(2002), 1437-1462.

[2] R. Glassey, Finite-time Blow-up for solutions of nonlinear wave equations. Math. Z. 177(1981), 323-340.

[3] E. Hebey and B. Pausader, An introduction to fourth order nonlinear wave equations, http://www.math.brown.edu/∼benoit/.

[4] J. Holmer and S. Roudenko, *A sharp condition for scattering of the radial 3d cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation.* Comm. Math. Phys. 282 (2008), no. 2, pp. 435–467.

[5] S. Ibrahim, N. Masmoudi, and K. Nakanishi, *Scattering threshold for the focusing nonlinear Klein–Gordon equation.* Preprint `arXiv:1001.1474`.

[6] C. Kenig, and F. Merle, *Global well-posedness, scattering, and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case*, Invent. Math. 166 (2006), no. 3, pp. 645–675.

[7] C. Kenig, and F. Merle, *Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing non-linear wave equation.* Acta Math. **201** (2008), no. 2, 147–212.

[8] P. Levandosky, Decay estimates for the fourth-order wave equations, J. Differential Equations 143 (1998) 360C413.

[9] P. Levandosky, Stability and instability of fourth solitary waves, J. Dynam. Differential Equations 10 (1998) 151C188.

[10] P. Levandosky and W. Strauss, Time decay for the nonlinear beam equation, *Methods and Applications of Analysis*, 7, (2000), 479–488.

[11] A.E.H. Love, A Treatise on the Mathematical Theory of Elasticity, Dover, New York, 1944.

[12] P.J. Mckenna, W. Water, Traveling waves in a suspension bridge, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 50 (1990) 703C715.

[13] C. Miao, The time–space estimates and low–energy scattering for nonlinear higher-order wave equations, Acta Math. Sinica, 38 (1995) 708–717 (in Chinese).

[14] C. Miao,The Modern Method of Nonlinear Wave Equations(Second Edition), Monographs on Modern Pure Mathematics, No.133. Science Press, Beijing, 2010.4.

[15] B. Pausader, Scattering and the Levandosky-Strauss conjecture for fourth order nonlinear wave equations, *J. Diff. Equ.*, 241 (2), (2007), 237–278.

[16] B. Pausader, Scattering for the beam equation in low dimensions, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 59 (3) (2010), 791–822.

[17] B. Pausader, S. Shao, The mass-critical fourth-order Schrödinger equation in high dimensions, J. Hyper. Diff. Eq. 2 (2010)

[18] L. Peletier, and W. Troy, Spatial patterns. Higher order models in Physics and Mechanics, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, Volume 45, Birkhäuser, 2001.

[19] T. Tao, A (concentration-)compact attractor for high-dimensional non-linear Schrödinger equations, Dynamics of PDE, 4 (2007), 1–53.

INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS, P. O. BOX 8009, BEIJING, CHINA, 100088,

E-mail address: `miao_changxing@iapcm.ac.cn`

INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PHYSICS AND COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS, P. O. BOX 8009, BEIJING, CHINA, 100088,

E-mail address: `yerfmath@yahoo.cn`